

Facilitators for the Advisory Committee on Marine Mammals and Anthropogenic Sound

Suzanne G. Orenstein
218 Common Lane
P.O. Box 375
Prides Crossing, MA 01965
978.922.1841
suzoren@aol.com

Lee M. Langstaff
24020 Old Hundred Road
Dickerson, MD 20842
301.407.0572
llangstaff@earthlink.net

Linda Manning
SRA International
2425 Wilson Blvd. 4th Floor
Arlington, VA 22202
703.247.4732
linda_manning@sra.com

MEMORANDUM

December 4, 2003

TO: Interviewees Consulted for the Process Assessment for a MMC Dialogue on Anthropogenic Noise and Marine Mammals
FROM: Suzanne Orenstein, Lee Langstaff and Linda Manning, Facilitators
SUBJECT: Process Assessment Report

Please find attached a copy of the Process Assessment Report for a Dialogue on Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Marine Mammals. The report was prepared for the Marine Mammal Commission by the independent facilitation team of Suzanne Orenstein, Lee Langstaff and Linda Manning. The report is the result of conversations with more than eighty individuals who generously responded to our request for interviews and who provided their time and attention with thoughtful, honest, and articulate input into this process.

The purpose of this assessment is to inform the Marine Mammal Commission's decision regarding whether and how to proceed with a collaborative dialogue process to address the complex and often controversial issues related to impacts of anthropogenic sound and marine mammals.

The interview findings support the creation of a multi-stakeholder collaborative group to discuss marine mammal and sound issues. Further, because the Marine Mammal Commission's purpose in convening such a group would be to advise the Commission, a federal agency, we believe it is reasonable that the group should take the form of a Federal Advisory Committee, in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

In addition to our assessment of the feasibility of a productive collaborative dialogue on this topic, the report summarizes the findings of the interviews, identifies areas we think would be most fruitful for productive discussion, and makes recommendations regarding the proposed Advisory Committee with regard to:

- Purpose, scope and goals
- Potential products
- Proposed workplan, including meeting topics and schedule
- Committee structure and function
- Participation

The Marine Mammal Commission will make final decisions regarding specific individuals who will be invited to participate on the committee and will issue invitations to them in the near future.

In writing this report, we have attempted to reflect accurately, clearly, and without bias the full range of perspectives provided to us in the interviews. Please feel free to contact us, if you feel that important issues or topics have been left out or have been inaccurately reflected.

This report is being sent to all of those interviewed, by e-mail and by U.S. mail. It will be publicly available on the Marine Mammal Commission's website at www.mmc.gov after December 10.

Thank you again for your help with this assessment process. We look forward to your continued interest in the project.

Process Assessment Report for a Dialogue on Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Marine Mammals

Prepared for the
Marine Mammal Commission
By the independent facilitation team of

**Suzanne Orenstein
Lee Langstaff
Linda Manning**

Under contract with the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

December 4, 2003

**Process Assessment for Dialogue on Impacts of
Anthropogenic Noise on Marine Mammals**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
A. Background	
B. Purpose and Goals of the Assessment	
C. Description of the Assessment Process	
II. Assessment of Feasibility of Productive Collaboration and Dialogue	3
A. Potential for Success	
B. Areas Most Amenable to Discussion and Possible Agreement	
C. Factors Affecting Success	
III. Summary of Interview Findings	5
A. Science and Research Questions and Concerns	
B. Research Process Issues	
C. Policy and Management Issues	
D. Other Issues of Concern	
E. Interviewee and Organizational Goals Regarding Marine Mammals and Sound	
F. Challenges for Dialogue Process	
G. Relative Emphasis on Science v. Policy Issues	
IV. Procedural Issues and Recommendations	13
A. Purpose, Goal and Scope for Proposed Committee	
B. Product	
C. Committee Structure	
D. Workplan	
E. Integration with Other Forums	
F. Participation	
G. Procedures	
H. Background Information	
I. Public Involvement and Outreach	
V. Conclusion	21
Appendices	
A. List of Individuals Interviewed	
B. Interview Questions	

Process Assessment for Dialogue on Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Marine Mammals

I. Introduction

A. Background

The U.S. Congress has directed the Marine Mammal Commission (via the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 2003) to organize a series of meetings to consider the impacts of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals, specifically “to share findings, survey acoustic threats to marine mammals, and develop means of reducing those threats while maintaining the oceans as a global highway of international commerce.” The Marine Mammal Commission (the Commission) has responded by exploring the potential for a multi-stakeholder dialogue focused on consideration of current understanding and available information regarding this complex topic, prioritizing outstanding research needs, and developing proposals for appropriate management actions while research is proceeding. The Commission through the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution has contracted with a team of professional facilitators who will help the Commission to assess the most promising approach to this effort and to conduct a meaningful and productive dialogue.

The Commission outlined for the facilitators at the beginning of the assessment process its desire to create a dialogue process that had a high likelihood of achieving a worthwhile and enduring result and further noted that the product of the process would be a report to Congress. The Commission noted that its plans to seek advice from the full range of interest groups about the content of that report would probably create the need to charter an Advisory Committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. In addition, the Commission was clear that it wanted to build on the work already completed by the National Research Council (NRC), which has produced three reports related to the issue of anthropogenic sound and marine mammals.¹

B. Purpose and goals of the assessment

A critical first step in considering and planning for a multi-stakeholder collaborative dialogue is to conduct a thorough and neutral assessment of the circumstances, issues and concerns - historical, current and evolving - that have brought the specific topic to the attention of decision makers. The purpose of the assessment is to inform the decision regarding whether to proceed with a collaborative dialogue process, and if so, what form it might take to optimize its success. To accomplish this, the specific goals of the assessment process include the identification of:

¹National Research Council (NRC). Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals. The National Academy Press, Washington, DC 2003

National Research Council (NRC). Marine Mammals and Low-Frequency Sound. The National Academy Press, Washington, DC 2000

National Research Council (NRC). Low-Frequency Sound and Marine Mammals: Current Knowledge and Research Needs. The National Academy Press, Washington, DC 1994

- the range of interested and affected parties;
- key issues and concerns that parties believe should be addressed by a dialogue for it to be meaningful;
- areas of controversy;
- areas of agreement or potential agreement;
- information and expertise needed for a well-informed dialogue;
- the level of interest in and support for a dialogue on the topic; and
- any external factors that could affect the success of a dialogue.

This information is then used to consider the feasibility of convening a productive dialogue, the potential representation of interests and membership in the dialogue group, the scope and focus of issues to be addressed, and the development of design options for the process.

C. Description of the assessment process

Working from an initial list compiled by the Marine Mammal Commission, and subsequently augmented by suggestions from interviewees themselves, the facilitation team interviewed eighty individuals, using an interview protocol that was designed to solicit the information described above.² Interviews were conducted by telephone and in person over a period of nine weeks from September 10 to November 14, 2003. Concurrently, a Federal Register Notice was issued announcing the potential for the formation of a Federal Advisory Committee and soliciting comment, including nominations for participants and issues for discussion.³ Comments received in response to this notice are considered part of the assessment process, and individuals nominated through this process were interviewed.

The range of individuals interviewed reflects the range of interests and perspectives on this topic. They included:

- producers and/or users of sound in the marine environment that has the potential to impact marine mammals and the marine environment (particularly oil and gas exploration and production, military sonar, scientific research, shipping, etc.);
- non-governmental environmental and animal welfare groups (national, international and regional);
- governmental authorities with responsibility for management of marine mammals and/or regulation or oversight of activities with potential impacts on marine mammals (federal and state); and
- scientific experts in the fields of study relevant to the assessment of potential impacts of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals.

It is worth noting that, overall, those interviewed were responsive, interested and supportive of an effort to bring people together to address this topic, and of the role of the Marine Mammal Commission in convening such a process. Without exception, interviewees were generous with their time and thoughtful in their responses to the interview questions. The facilitation team believes that this bodes well for the prospects of a productive dialogue.

² The list of individuals interviewed is included as Appendix A; a copy of the interview protocol is attached as Appendix B).

³ Federal Register /Vol 68, No. 203 /Tuesday, October 21, 2003/Notices/60120

The information and insights collected through this assessment are summarized in this report. Issues identified as important by various interviewees are outlined in some detail. Recommendations regarding the structure of a Federal Advisory Committee process are also described in detail.

II. Assessment of Feasibility of Productive Collaboration and Dialogue

A. Potential for Success

The interview results support the creation of a multi-stakeholder group to discuss and collaborate on marine mammal and sound issues. Because the Commission has stated its intention to seek advice from the range of interest groups about its report to Congress, the stakeholder group should be structured as a Federal Advisory Committee. The interviews did not identify any significant barriers to an Advisory Committee approach, and thus the facilitation team focused much of the interview process on how the discussions could be structured to be most productive, rather than on whether the discussions should occur.

The process assessment for a policy dialogue/Federal Advisory Committee on anthropogenic sound and marine mammals has generated considerable interest and engagement from the affected interest groups. The issues that such a Committee can address are highly dynamic and controversial, in part because both the science and policy are emerging arenas, and the problems are broad in scope and not well understood. The facilitation team, after conducting over eighty interviews, is impressed with the high level of knowledge and commitment to these issues from all involved. There was very little questioning about whether an Advisory Committee would be useful, and many of the interviewees made excellent suggestions for structuring the process, and indicated their desire to participate and make progress on the topic. The issues are complex and challenging to discuss in a cross-disciplinary fashion, but that is what is needed at this time, given the desire to address implementation of the NRC reports and avoid litigation.

B. Areas Most Amenable to Discussion and Possible Agreement

The interviews identified several issue areas that appear to be amenable to discussion and, possibly, agreement in an Advisory Committee process. Among the areas most frequently mentioned as potentially productive in the interviews are the following:

- There is a need to stabilize and make more predictable what is at times a very dynamic process of developing the science and applying it to management actions. The proposed Advisory Committee could help in that effort by crafting recommendations for a comprehensive, implementable, coordinated approach to moving forward on the science and the policy issues over the next ten-to-fifteen years. Some referred to this approach as a “road map” or research implementation plan for the previous NRC reports.
- As part of the “road map” the most important research questions for the near and far term should be discussed and prioritized. Agreement on research priorities will benefit from the involvement of all stakeholders, though it may be important to note that introducers of

sound are likely to develop information outside of the priorities to support their future activities and regulatory affairs.

- There are barriers to moving forward with the scientific and regulatory efforts that may be addressed successfully through collaboration. Options suggested for addressing these barriers include establishing independent administration of research funding that may help produce information that is credible with multiple stakeholders, pooling funds to improve research capabilities and designs, coordinating monitoring and data management efforts to build a more available and reliable information base for all involved, and integrating U.S. scientific efforts, policies and approaches with those in other countries.
- The management questions that will arise as the science moves forward have created many of the legal and policy controversies to date. Some of these may be addressed by an Advisory Committee through discussion and development of recommendations to the Marine Mammal Commission and Congress. Fruitful areas for discussion that could improve understanding and develop approaches to reduce the management-related controversies include:
 - ~ what constitutes a quality risk assessment;
 - ~ when do you have enough information to determine the effects of sound producing activities;
 - ~ whether and/or how to mitigate for some impacts; and
 - ~ whether and/or how to conduct research activities that may produce some marine mammal impacts but benefit the mammals in the long run.

C. Factors Affecting Success

Experience with past voluntary collaborative efforts has shown that certain factors can affect success of these processes. The assessment team reviewed the interview results to determine whether and how certain prerequisites for success are met. The assessment process established that the proposed Advisory Committee has the potential to succeed because it meets some key criteria for success, as outlined below.

- The process will be product focused, given the need for a report from the Commission to Congress, and the desire of the Commission to identify useful and implementable ideas to include in that report. This focus will provide direction and incentives for participants to tackle the tough issues inherent in this topic.
- Representatives of all affected interest groups are willing to participate. Affected interest groups are defined as including those who may be involved in implementing the proposed Committee's product, those with resources to apply to solutions, those with information essential to creating a high quality product, and those who can block implementation of the product. For this process, there may be some hesitation to participation from groups who are not currently engaged in the debate, such as the shipping industry, but even in that case some representation of those interests is achievable.

- Expertise is available to inform the discussions and the outcome. Scientists interviewed expressed willingness to work with the Commission and the proposed Advisory Committee to evaluate the existing science and develop an understanding of the most important future directions for scientific inquiry and documentation. Many interviewees pointed out that the National Research Council (NRC) has already produced recommendations for improving the science, and the future directions for scientific exploration. They suggested that the proposed Advisory Committee build on those efforts, rather than duplicate them.
- Necessary time and resources are available to conduct the collaborative effort, and there is a deadline that provides a backstop and endpoint to the effort.
- Most parties feel they have something to gain from the process. Potential gains most often mentioned were: preventing further gridlock on policy questions, engaging in a forum for meaningful discussion of some of the uncertainties and plans for addressing them, and helping to shape the approaches that will be developed for future management activities.

III. Summary of Interview Findings

The summary of issues that follows represents an effort to reflect accurately, in some detail, and without judgment or bias, the input received from the interviews conducted. This section focuses primarily on responses to four of the questions in the interview protocol:

- What do you believe are the critical questions/issues that need to be addressed to take this issue to the next level?
- What are your/your organizations goals with respect to this issue?
- What do you think are the major challenges or barriers that will need to be addressed in order to make meaningful progress on this topic?
- What do you think would be the appropriate relative emphasis on science versus management and policy in a new discussion?

The responses to these four questions were used extensively to guide the recommendations about how to structure the proposed Advisory Committee process. Issues and concerns raised in interviews fell into several categories: science and research, research process, policy and management and other issues raised.

A. Science and Research Questions and Concerns

Interviewees emphasized that the magnitude of what we still do not understand about marine mammals and the impacts of anthropogenic noise creates an atmosphere of considerable uncertainty and, often, controversy. The scientific process of addressing these issues is unfolding slowly and faces many challenges, many of them a function of the difficulty of studying these widely dispersed, difficult to observe, ocean-dwelling animals.

From the points of view of the interviewees, the scientific questions most in need of being addressed are those related to understanding the nature and extent of the problem in order to characterize and quantify the threat. This is necessary to understand the extent and types of management or mitigation that are needed and/or would be effective to minimize or eliminate the threats.

Interviewees noted the following specific areas where scientific inquiry is needed:

1. **Understanding the sources of sound and their characteristics** (frequency, duration, loudness, location, chronic versus acute/episodic, cumulative impacts, etc.)
2. **Understanding the characteristics of marine mammals as the receivers of sound.** That is, how does sound affect marine mammals? We need a much better understanding of:
 - marine mammal hearing, including basic hearing physiology, validation and improved understanding of temporary threshold shift (TTS) and permanent threshold shift (PTS), short and long-term implications for both behavioral changes and injury; and the role and significance of masking;
 - the use of sound by marine mammals, including the characteristics of sounds they themselves produce and use (communication and echolocation, active and passive uses, etc.);
 - likely pathways of impacts (including auditory and non-auditory mechanisms) and the relationships between behavioral impacts and injury;
 - the implications of chronic noise (e.g. from shipping);
 - thresholds of noise that cause significant behavioral changes and/or lead to injury for different types of sound, different species, and different conditions; and
 - differences and similarities in all of the above among various species or groupings of species, age classes, and sexes (including why certain species such as beaked whales appear to respond as they do).
3. **Baseline natural history, biology and ecology of marine mammals.** With limited information on normal behaviors, populations and distribution, etc., it is difficult to assess changes that may be the result of the introduction of noise. Specific areas suggested for exploration include:
 - habitat needs and identification of sensitive areas/seasons;
 - status and distribution of populations;
 - patterns of movements in various spatial and temporal scales;
 - role of sound and hearing in maintaining behaviors necessary to healthy populations.
4. Careful consideration of assumptions made and **the usefulness and validity of extrapolation of data** between marine mammal species, between terrestrial (including human) and marine species, and from very small numbers of individual animals to larger numbers.
5. **Systematic collection and evaluation of correlational data.** Data on strandings and noise generation exist that could provide potentially valuable insights. Interviewees on all sides of the debate noted the need for these and other data to be centralized and made more accessible.
6. Assessment of **the effectiveness of different mitigation strategies** (e.g. ramp-up, safety zones, etc.).

B. Research Process Issues

Interviewees identified a number of challenges that are hampering the ability to increase and/or improve research on marine mammals and sound. These are summarized below.

1. Greater mutual understanding and **agreement on research priorities** could help bring more cooperation to this issue. Interest groups do not agree on where research energies should be focused.
2. An often lengthy, and sometimes unpredictable, **permitting process** causes delays and diversions of resources needed for the research itself. Much marine mammal research is seasonally dependent, and delays can be costly and, in some cases, create barriers to conducting research.
3. There is **controversy over the use of sound in research to determine its effects**. It is troubling to some that in order to determine the effects of different kinds and levels of sound it may be necessary to intentionally expose animals to potentially harmful sound. Some interests accept that it may be necessary to cause harm to a limited number of individuals in the short term in order to gain greater certainty regarding the effects of sound. Others do not.
4. The **assumption by some that some science and research is biased based on its funding source** has caused and continues to cause controversy among groups and individuals, making collaboration and joint problem solving extremely difficult. While some feel strongly that this is a false assumption, it is generally acknowledged that even the perception of bias is problematic. Many interviewees suggested the need to explore the potential for an independently administered, credible (peer reviewed) and transparent process for funding scientific research on marine mammals and sound.
5. Some interviewees expressed **the desire for greater openness and transparency with respect to data analysis related to specific incidents** (e.g. examining possible links between anthropogenic noise and strandings, necropsies on animals, etc.).
6. The **research needs are huge, and the resources available to conduct the research are limited** both in terms of funding and in the number of scientists qualified and available to accomplish research goals and needs. Many scientists pointed out that there is a relatively small community of scientists working on the relevant topics, which limits the existing research capacity.
7. There is a need for focus on **improving data-gathering tools and methodologies**. Interviewees noted the difficulty of studying marine mammals, particularly cetaceans, which are often wide-ranging, deep-diving, and long-lived. Observations of these animals are often unpredictable, localized, and involve small numbers that may or may not be representative of entire stocks, populations, or species. Normal behaviors are difficult to observe in the wild, and for most species, cannot be observed in captivity. New technologies are needed, as is greater access to (and resources for) existing and emerging research technologies, not only for studying marine mammals, but also for preventing undesirable impacts during sound-producing activities like oil and gas exploration, submarine location, etc.

C. Policy and Management Issues

Interviewees acknowledged the enormous difficulty in policy development and regulatory decision-making that results from the high level of scientific uncertainty regarding impacts of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals. There is general agreement that the science needed to inform policy is not yet developed to the point of providing strong direction for making such determinations. Even if the science were more conclusive and available to decision makers, it might not solve the problem of determining what consequences are acceptable (or not), as a matter of public policy. When there is great uncertainty about the science, the consequences of policy decisions are more open to criticism and legal challenge.

The following issues and questions related to policy, regulation and impact management were identified by interviewees as critical to the discussion of this topic:

1. **How precautionary should policies be in view of the high level of uncertainty?** Not surprisingly, some interviewees believe we should seriously curtail noise-producing activities until we have better information, while others believe that without clear evidence of a problem, activities should be allowed to proceed until science can identify specific harmful impacts. Related to this are questions such as:
 - What is the acceptable level of risk to marine mammals, and how can we assess risk in the absence of better scientific understanding?
 - What constitutes a biologically significant impact of sound on marine mammals, from a regulatory standpoint?
 - How do we apply the MMPA's definitions of "take" or "harassment"? How can we use available information to develop a useful, science-based system to define take, harassment, and negligible impact?
 - Should national security issues play a role in marine mammal risk assessment, and if so, when and how should they?
 - On whom should the "burden of proof" lie with regard to activities likely to affect marine mammals?
2. Policy decisions are being made in the absence of greater clarity of scientific understanding, at least in the short-term. The regulated community seeks **predictability and transparency in the regulation** of their activities that takes into account the emerging nature of the policy development.
3. Policy makers must reflect the standards of applicable statutes, such as the MMPA including the requirement that those proposing activities likely to "take" marine mammals demonstrate to the regulatory agencies that the proposed activities will have no more than a negligible impact on marine mammal stocks. How can these requirements be clarified to improve the regulatory process?
4. A full **range of management options, including mitigation, to minimize potential impacts** should be developed, and mechanisms for evaluating their effectiveness are needed. Among the mitigation options mentioned by interviewees were:

- Safe and accurate methods and technologies for avoiding acoustic impacts on marine mammals;
- geographic and/or seasonal exclusion zones;
- more effective monitoring methods and observation tools;
- quieting technologies for ships;
- ramp-up strategies;
- elimination or minimization of unnecessary noise production (e.g., non-constant operation of sonar by ships);
- safety zones.

D. Other Issues of Concern

1. Many noted the **need to improve public understanding of the issues** related to marine mammals and anthropogenic sound. Attempts to simplify the issue have sometimes led to inaccurate understanding. As it seeks solutions, the public policy debate needs to be elevated to a level that will take into account the complexity and uncertainty inherent in this topic. Scientists, government agencies, environmental groups and the regulated community all have an important role to play in ensuring that the public debate addresses the problems and issues accurately and neither sweeps important dimensions under the rug nor mischaracterizes an issue for political purposes.
2. **Dialogue on this issue needs to be international in scope**, from the standpoint of both science and policy. Marine mammals and propagation of sound in the ocean do not respect political boundaries, and solutions will ultimately require international attention and collaboration. International treaties and laws, and international bodies such as the European Union and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as well as individual national governments, multi-national corporations, international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and scientists will have roles to play. Some international entities are already actively considering this issue, and those activities should be brought to the attention of the policy dialogue being contemplated here.
3. The interviews revealed that one factor in the controversy over this topic is what might be described as **fundamental value differences among parties regarding marine mammal protection** and the appropriate relationship between marine mammals and humans, including the extent to which marine mammals are deserving of a level of respect equivalent to that afforded to humans. Most of those interviewed indicated an awareness of these value differences and their roles in the polarized debates, and many also indicated a willingness to look for solutions that realistically reflect the range of interests and perspectives on this issue.

E. Interviewee and Organizational Goals Regarding Marine Mammals and Sound

Responses to the question regarding the goals of the interviewees and their organizations with regard to the topic of marine mammals and noise fell into several categories: policy and management goals, science and research goals, process-related goals, and overall goals. These categories, and the order in which they appear, are not meant to imply any prioritization, nor are they intended to constrain the scope of discussion of any particular goal described. The interviewee responses listed below identify the variety of goals of individual organizations, and do not reflect any general consensus.

1. Process goals

- Clarify among parties what battles we really need to fight and not create unnecessary and unproductive disputes. Getting agreement on what we know with confidence would be a first step, as it will help us understand the things we really need to be worried about.
- Improve relations among parties. There is a relatively small community of actively interested parties who must work together in order to make progress on this topic.
- Improve sharing of information that has been collected, including data regarding strandings and noise producing activities.
- Educate and engage sound producers for whom noise is a by-product and look for ways to eliminate or minimize “needless” noise.

2. Policy and management/mitigation goals. Interviewees noted that their organizations are variously working toward:

- Policies that balance environmental concerns with other uses of the marine environment including resource exploration and extraction, national security, transportation, and commerce.
- Policies that respect and protect marine mammal welfare and incorporate management and mitigation actions in the near term even while we are awaiting more and “better” science. These might include, at a minimum, keeping noise away from areas sensitive for cetaceans.
- Policies that reflect the assumption that it is unlikely that there is no cost to cetaceans from the introduction of sound in the marine environment.
- Greater clarity and predictability and consistency in regulatory processes.
- Use of peer-reviewed scientific research in regulatory decision-making.
- Accountability in international and regional waters particular for the navies of the world, perhaps in the form of an international treaty addressing noise in the oceans.
- Revisions to Marine Mammal Protection Act thresholds and criteria for harassment.
- Ceasing the use/deployment of sound sources in question at least until we have a better understanding of their potential harm to marine mammals (e.g. LFA, hull-mounted sonar, invasive research).

3. Science and research goals

- Revise the research permitting process so that it is not a barrier to obtaining the scientific understanding needed to ensure protection of marine mammals.
- Identify what information we most need to know to protect marine mammals from noise, and target research to address those questions.

- Establish a mechanism for independent funding of research with a peer review process.
- Clarify where there are disagreements over the science.

4. Overall goals

- Common support for a way forward that will put an end to what has been a “reeling” from crisis to crisis with finger pointing and costly battles.
- Joint development of, and buy-in for, a plan for the next 10-15 years that includes:
 - ~ a constructive role for all parties that addresses how to get the needed information through credible research,
 - ~ guidance for how to manage, mitigate, and permit relevant activities, and
 - ~ an increase in the quality of the level of public understanding and debate on the issue.

F. Challenges for a Dialogue Process

Interviewees related a number of challenges and barriers that will need to be acknowledged and addressed, if not overcome, in order to make meaningful progress on the issues regarding marine mammals and anthropogenic noise. These included:

- Existing scientific understanding does not provide clear guidance for the policy makers. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that there are widely differing views on the implications of uncertainty for the policy making process. This tends to play itself out in debates over where the burden of proof lies, and how much precaution should be applied.
- The scientific complexity of this topic makes it difficult for all stakeholders to engage effectively in the public policy debate. Expertise in highly specialized scientific disciplines such as acoustic physics, marine mammal hearing, behavior and biology, and physical oceanography is critical to understanding this topic. It has been and continues to be an enormous challenge to communicate and share information accurately and productively between disciplines and among stakeholders with differing levels of scientific, and political expertise. The public decisions that address the complexity need to be understood by all constituent groups, so efforts need to be made to summarize, synthesize, and explain the reasoning behind those decisions.
- Interviewees expressed the view that incentives for meaningful and productive participation in the dialogue by key parties may be difficult to establish, particularly with regard to the U.S. Navy and the commercial shipping industry. The Navy has sought relief from regulation and litigation through exemptions from environmental laws, which could remove some of their incentives to engage in voluntary collaboration. The shipping industry, and others for whom the generation of sound is incidental, are not convinced at this time that the sound they are producing is causing any significant problem. The likelihood of their being regulated on this issue is perceived as remote and thus the issue is not a high priority for their attention.
- Interactions among scientists, environmental groups, regulators and producers/users of sound have become strained and in some cases negative, resulting in a breakdown of trust and credibility. This negative dynamic is hampering the constructive, multi-disciplinary collaboration required to

make progress on this complex issues. Most interviewees acknowledged this and expressed a desire to put it behind them.

- The scientific research community has a dual role with regard to this topic. They cannot be viewed exclusively as a resource for scientific expertise, because they are also members of the regulated community, as they may be required to obtain research permits for studies requiring the use of sound in the marine environment.

G. Relative Emphasis on Science and Research versus Policy and Management

Virtually everyone indicated that the science and policy dimensions are linked and that both need to be addressed. The majority indicated that, in the dialogue process, the relative emphasis on each should be about equal or have slightly greater emphasis on the policy and management side. The following points were made in support of this approach:

- Discussion of the state of the scientific knowledge and identification of science gaps and needs has received a great deal of attention already (for example, in the three NRC reports). While it is important to capture the essence of what science can and cannot tell us, a meaningful policy discussion has been lacking to date and this is an opportunity for a forum to address management and mitigation strategies given the science we have in hand.
- We cannot postpone consideration of mitigation options until we have all of the conclusive science we would like to have, since such conclusions are not likely to be forthcoming in the next decade. Policies to manage human activities that generate potentially harmful sound in the marine environment are needed now.
- It would be very easy, but not desirable, to get engrossed in the numerous scientific questions related to this topic and never get to the policy and management decisions that are the essence of the current dissonance.
- The dialogue effort will require a mutual understanding of the complexity and uncertainty of the science, and should also weigh-in on research priorities, which will inform the discussion of policy issues and the critical goals of management.
- Begin with science discussion to 1) establish mutual understanding and agreement on what we can say we know now with some level of scientific confidence, 2) acknowledge where there is disagreement on what the science tells us, and 3) reach agreement on research priorities to address disagreement, uncertainty, and critical gaps in our understanding. Then, the group should move on to a discussion of its policy goals, and how best to apply the available science to management and mitigation.
- This dialogue process represents an opportunity for the full range of stakeholders to participate in the process of defining how the future research and regulatory program may evolve.
- A handful of those interviewed indicated a preference for greater emphasis on science (60 – 75%) than on policy, emphasizing that the fundamental debate is over the characteristics of sound and

its impacts on marine mammals, and the need for science to be the foundation for the policy. Others noted that the NRC reports already deal with the science, and we should not spend a great deal of additional energy on that.

IV. Procedural Issues and Recommendations

As noted earlier, the Commission plans to seek advice from the full range of interest groups on marine mammal and sound issues. Because of this intention, the policy dialogue should be chartered as a Federal Advisory Committee, and should be structured to achieve its goals as outlined below. The proposed Advisory Committee will be asked to review the recommendations outlined below for the structure, workplan, and other procedural elements at its initial meeting, making changes as can be agreed upon in the discussion. The following recommendations and process suggestions incorporate the ideas elicited in the interviews, and are intended to create a starting point for the proposed Advisory Committee as it begins to direct its own efforts.

A. Purpose, Goal and Scope for Proposed Advisory Committee

Congress directed the Marine Mammal Commission to “hold a series of meetings to share findings, survey acoustic ‘threats’ to marine mammals, and develop means of reducing those threats while maintaining the oceans as a global highway of international commerce.” The Commission will report on their efforts to Congress in mid-2005, and has determined that it will work with the Advisory Committee to produce a report. The proposed Advisory Committee will submit a report to the Marine Mammal Commission’s Commissioners and Committee of Scientific Advisors, and then the Commission will submit its report to Congress.

Therefore, the **stated purpose of the proposed Advisory Committee is to produce a report of its findings and recommendations to the Marine Mammal Commission for inclusion in the Commission’s report to Congress.** Based on the interviews, **an appropriate specific goal for the proposed Advisory Committee would be to work toward agreement on a comprehensive, coordinated, and implementable plan or approach to guide scientific and policy efforts on marine mammals and sound over the next ten to fifteen years.** To be constructive and effective, the plan outlined in the report should include:

1. a current assessment of the extent of knowledge about the threats,
2. recommendations for focusing research on the issues most important to resolving regulatory and policy controversies and most amenable to study with current research capabilities, and
3. suggestions for management and mitigation methods with recommendations about how those methods should (or should not) be applied.

The scope of the proposed Committee’s work should be broad enough to fulfill the Congressional request. It should, to the extent feasible, assess all threats to marine mammals from the full range of anthropogenic sound sources, taking into account the fact that impacts from certain sources may be more urgent or significant. Its discussions should extend to international institutions, resources, and management approaches.

B. Products

The proposed Advisory Committee on Anthropogenic Sound and Marine Mammals will be charged by the Commission to develop, with the Commission, as much consensus as achievable on the topics discussed. The discussions, agreements and disagreements, and any consensus achieved will be documented in a report that will be reviewed and adopted by the Committee.

During the proposed Committee's 12-18 months of operation, interim products may be developed. These may include balanced summaries of each meeting and any draft recommendations proposed and/or agreed upon as the Committee addresses each meeting's specific topic.

C. Committee Structure

1) Plenary Group: The Advisory Committee should have a plenary group of approximately 25 members who become educated about the issues within the scope of the Committee's inquiry and analysis, and who are responsible for endorsing the final report, including any recommendations that the Committee may wish to include in that report. The plenary Committee will have access to scientific resources and advice and can form subcommittees, all of which will work at the direction of the plenary Committee. Further, the Committee and all subcommittees should include a balance of views among the regulated community, public interest groups and governmental entities with authority or interests in the outcome.

2) Subcommittees: The full Advisory Committee may establish subcommittees to assist it in developing draft products or proposals for consideration at specific plenary sessions. All subcommittees should work at the direction of and report to the plenary Committee. The proposed Advisory Committee will need to develop a brief scope of work for each subcommittee it creates, outlining the desired expertise, schedule, and desired product.

3) Technical Resources: The need to have the best and most useful scientific information available to the Committee was mentioned in most interviews and is a high priority for the Commission as well. The Commission has stated its intention to support the development of good information, and to work with the Committee to identify and encourage the information gathering activities needed to inform the Committee's deliberations, within their resource and budget constraints.

There are several options for obtaining the necessary information for the Committee's deliberations. The Committee should consider these options at its first meeting.

- The Committee members themselves will have expertise to share, and their organizations may provide support to them to increase the information available.
- The Commission has established a subcommittee of its own Committee of Scientific Advisors, consisting of John Hildebrand, Doug Wartzok, Daryl Boness, and Barbara Taylor. This subcommittee can be available individually or as a group to assist the Committee
- Scientific experts and resource people may be invited to participate in specific discussions or meetings, making such presentations and preparing or reviewing such written materials as the Committee may request.

- The Committee could decide to establish a standing subcommittee of technical resource people to work on questions the Committee poses.

If the Committee finds that additional input from individuals with particular areas of expertise is essential to its deliberations, the Commission should find ways to assure adequate and appropriate input from such experts.

Examples of products that may require input from technical resources are 1) presentations providing background information, 2) a review of the scientific information to date on the topic of anthropogenic sound impacts on marine mammals, and 3) a description of management and mitigation methods and options currently available or under development, with a summary of available scientific information about their effectiveness and/or impacts

D. Workplan

Table 1 provides an overview of the proposed schedule and topics for each plenary meeting. Additional information about the schedule and sequence of activities is provided here. The overview will be refined, along with the schedule, as the Advisory Committee plans together during its meetings.

The proposed Advisory Committee is funded to meet five times, beginning in February 2004. It will meet approximately quarterly. The meetings should occur roughly in February, April, July, and November in 2004, and in February 2005.

The major substantive topics that need to be discussed involve 1) assessing the state of knowledge to date; 2) understanding what the most important substantive questions are; 3) prioritizing and planning for how those questions will be addressed in the future; and 4) discussing the policy, management, and mitigation implications for anthropogenic sound activities given the state of the knowledge. The sequence of topics should reflect this progression of tasks: defining the problem, determining the information base available for addressing it, and focusing on the policy and management/mitigation implications of the characteristics of the problem and the information available. Not surprisingly, some interviewees place a higher priority on discussing the scientific questions, while others place a higher priority on discussing the management questions. The placement of issues in the sequence of meetings does not imply any greater urgency or priority on the issues discussed in the early phases, but is meant to build the information base before tackling the policy and management questions.

Advisory Committee on Anthropogenic Sound and Marine Mammals

TABLE 1: Facilitators' Recommendations for Plenary Meetings

PLENARY MEETING 1	WORKSHOP 1	PLENARY MEETING 2	PLENARY MEETING 3	WORKSHOP 2	PLENARY MEETING 4	PLENARY MEETING 5
February 3,4,5 2004 (3 days) Washington, DC	April 13-16 2004 Maryland	Week of April 26, 2004 (2.5 days) Washington, DC	July 2004 (3-4 days) Southern California	Fall, 2004 Italy	November 2004 (3-4 days) New Orleans, Louisiana	February 2005 (3 days) Washington, DC
Introduction to Issues and Process	Beaked Whale Technical Workshop	Risk Assessment Issues	Scientific Issues: • Status of knowledge • Barriers • Priorities	International Regulatory & Scientific Efforts	Management and Mitigation Issues	Final Report
Discussion of Committee Goal, Process, and Scope Presentations and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basics of Sound, esp. in water Sound sources of interest or concern (presentations by sound producers and sound overview) Characteristics of sounds of concern Cetacean uses of sound Impacts of sound on marine mammals (auditory and non-auditory, behavior, etc.) Overview of relevant U.S. regulatory authorities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is a good risk assessment model for marine mammals? (Panel) Challenges in risk assessment processes, especially uncertainties Presentations - NOAA Fisheries Guidelines: *Science Panel Conclusions *Purpose of Guidelines *Overview of matrix *Discussion of issues raised, assumptions, extrapolation, if not this, what? - Other risk assessment approaches *FWS, NGO, UK Navy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation from Subcommittee on research synthesis Relevant highlights from Workshop 1 Develop list of what is agreed upon Develop list of research needs and priorities Discuss barriers to addressing priorities, e.g. *Availability of researchers *Need for independence of funding source *Permit regulations *Other 		Presentations from Subcommittee on management options re: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Mitigation & Mgt tools/approaches (include international) Range of options for short and longer term What is needed to get improved mitigation options in the future, including technology and risk management advances Relevant highlights from Workshop 2 Other issues that arise in previous meetings	Discuss and agree on Language for final Report to MMC
Products: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement on purpose and scope, operating procedures, Committee structure, and schedule Plan for information needed for future discussions, especially research synthesis for Meeting 3 		Products: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of discussion and suggestions and/or concerns Plan for information needed for discussion on management issues and options at Meeting 4 	Products: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRAFT summary of what is known and agreed upon DRAFT list of research priorities DRAFT recommendations for addressing barriers to research 		Product: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft recommendations on management strategies 	Product: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Report to MMC to include recommendations produced at previous meetings and others as needed

E. Integration with other forums

Another sequence issue for the process is how to integrate the Advisory Committee with the many other forums in which the overlapping issues are being raised and addressed. Among those mentioned in the interviews were the beaked whale technical workshop sponsored by the Marine Mammal Commission, the effort at NOAA Fisheries to develop guidelines on acoustic impacts on marine mammals, the NRC Committee addressing biological significance and the definition of harassment, MMPA reauthorization activities, a March 2004 UK Navy meeting to consider mitigation measures, and NOAA Fisheries workshops on shipping noise and on non-auditory impacts of sonar on marine mammals. In addition, many scientific meetings, including international conferences, include some focus on these issues. It is important that the Advisory Committee on Anthropogenic Sound and Marine Mammals coordinate with these and other efforts in order to avoid duplication of effort, and to ensure that the Committee's product is complete.

To achieve the desired integration, it will be important to provide time in the Committee's process to receive and review reports from the other forums, to have overlapping membership with those forums to assist in coordination and information exchange, to have the option for Committee members to observe other workshops and forums, and to have the option of recommending additional workshops as needed to bring an increased focus to a specific topic. The interviews produced one suggestion for a workshop to deal specifically with international science and policy efforts, and a proposal was made to hold this workshop at the NATO SACLANT facility in La Spezia, Italy. This workshop could be open to Committee members who desired to attend, and would require significant lead time to arrange, so it should be scheduled in the fall of 2004, between the Committee's fourth and fifth meetings.

NOAA Fisheries will be conducting a public review of its proposed Guidelines for Acoustic Impacts during the spring of 2004. NOAA Fisheries and the Commission have noted that the Guidelines will be of interest to the proposed Advisory Committee members and relevant to the Committee's discussions. NOAA Fisheries further noted that they would benefit from a thorough discussion of the Guidelines with the Advisory Committee as part of the scoping process for an EIS that NOAA Fisheries will conduct for the Guidelines. Thus, the second Advisory Committee meeting, scheduled for late April 2004, will include a presentation and thorough discussion of the proposed Guidelines.

F. Participation

For the Advisory Committee process to be credible and effective, the participation needs to reflect the full range of views on the issues that will be discussed and be balanced among the affected interests. This balance is required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act and also helps create products that are useful and will not be blocked by strong constituencies who are not involved. Committee representation should include balanced representation from the regulated community, public interest groups and NGOs who participate in the regulation process, and government authorities. There is a further need to have a manageable group size to allow debate and discussion in some depth. When these two criteria are combined, we find that the optimal size for a group with such a substantive task is 25 or fewer members. Thus, choices need to be made regarding whom to involve directly in the Advisory Committee.

1. Recommended list of participating organizations

The following list of participants was developed based on the input received by the facilitation team in the interviews and on the need to have balance among the interests at the table. Many of the suggested groups were recommended repeatedly, and often by groups outside of their interest group, as useful dialogue participants. These are the entities that would comprise the plenary group of the proposed Advisory Committee, and which will be responsible for producing and endorsing the Committee's product.

Governmental Authorities (6)

National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), Office of Protected Resources
(Headquarters)
NOAA Fisheries, Regional Office
Minerals Management Service, Office of Offshore Minerals Management (Headquarters)
Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico Region
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
California Coastal Commission

Regulated Community (12)

U.S. Navy, Office of Environment, Naval Operations
U.S. Navy, Fleet Operations
Marine Mammal Researchers (3)
Oil and Gas Exploration and Production
International Association of Geophysical Contractors
Chamber of Shipping of America
Consortium for Oceanographic Research and Education
Wood Hole Oceanographic Institute
Scripps Institute of Oceanography
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory

Non-Governmental Organizations (6)

Natural Resources Defense Council
Humane Society of the United States
International Fund for Animal Welfare
The Ocean Conservancy
The Ocean Mammal Institute
The Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society

2. Criteria for Participation

Further, each individual member that is selected to participate from one of these organizations should display personal and organizational characteristics that are likely to make them successful at participating in this dialogue and representing others with similar views. In selecting members, the following criteria should be used:

- has ability and willingness to represent others with similar views (i.e. the individual can represent a constituency);
- represents a constituency that is likely to be affected by the recommendations or other outcomes;
- is knowledgeable and has expertise about the issues that will be discussed; and
- is viewed by others as providing constructive leadership on the issues.

3. Marine Mammal Commission Role

The Marine Mammal Commission should be represented by two individuals who will participate in all discussions and bring the Commission's views to the table. The Commission also will be the entity receiving the report and recommendations from the Advisory Committee. The Commission has stated its desire for a report that can be implemented, to the extent it is possible to anticipate implementation challenges. Therefore, it is important for the Commission to participate in the discussions and be open about its views, especially about what it is prepared to communicate to Congress on these issues. That will prevent a problem that sometimes arises when an Advisory Committee completes its work, but the resulting recommendations are unacceptable to the agency charged with implementing or moving forward with the recommendations, and the product is abandoned. The Commission has indicated its willingness to take forward to Congress all the consensus items on which it and the Committee are able to agree, and, for any items on which they do not agree, the disagreement will be noted and the Commission will decide what, if anything, to recommend on that issue.

G. Procedures

Draft Operating Procedures for the Advisory Committee will be circulated in advance of the first meeting for Committee review. They will be discussed, revised, and finalized by the full Committee at its first meeting.

Key issues for the operating procedures are outlined below to help the Committee in its review prior to the discussion at the first meeting.

Definition of Consensus: When any group strives to develop some level of consensus, it is important to define what the group will consider to be a consensus in advance of the decision making efforts. The facilitation team recommends the following: **Consensus is defined as all Committee members are willing to live with (and not actively oppose) the recommendation or decision.** If the Advisory Committee cannot reach consensus on an issue that it feels should be included in its report, it may choose to outline the disagreement in the report. As noted previously, the Commission intends to use in its report to Congress any recommendations on which there is a consensus that includes the Commission. On issues where the Committee does not or cannot reach consensus, the Commission may develop, if it so chooses, its own recommendations to Congress on those issues.

Responsibilities of Members: Committee members are responsible for:

- representing the views of other members in their constituency and/or groups with similar interests, and for communicating with others in their interest group to fulfill that responsibility;
- clearly and fully articulating the issues and concerns that are significant to their organizations and constituents;
- attending each meeting or coordinating with an alternate to attend and participate;
- bringing the endorsement of their organizations to the eventual product;
- sharing all relevant information that will assist the Committee in achieving its goals;
- resolving process issues within the Committee structure;
- refraining from speaking for the Committee in public forums, unless the Committee has specifically asked them to do so; and
- ensuring that the views and opinions they express in the Committee are consistent with the views they express in other forums.

Maintaining Credibility and Balance for the Advisory Committee: The Advisory Committee will meet quarterly for the most part, and issues regarding the management of the Committee's process may arise and need input from the various interest groups in between meetings. The Advisory Committee may need to consider appointing a small (5-6) member Steering Committee to work with the Commission and the facilitators to provide guidance on procedural issues that may arise. If the Committee does establish a Steering Committee, its membership should be balanced to reflect the plenary membership.

H. Background information

Several interviewees made suggestions for background information that should be provided to the Committee in advance of the first meeting. Among the most commonly suggested items are:

- copies of the previous NRC reports,
- an overview of the current regulatory process,
- a chronology of the incidents that have caused concern (i.e. strandings, lawsuits to stop projects, ship shock incidents, etc.),
- the first chapter or two from Marine Mammals and Noise by Richardson et al.⁴

The first meeting will focus on presentations from various Committee members on sources and characteristics of sound, and marine mammal interaction with sound sources. All presentations and materials developed for those presentations should be made widely available.

⁴ Richardson, John W., Charles R. Greene, Jr., Charles I. Malme, and Denis H. Johnson. Marine Mammals and Noise. Academic Press, New York 1995.

I. Public Involvement and Targeted Outreach

Most of those interviewed indicated that they would like to follow the proposed Advisory Committee efforts in some detail, even if they were not appointed to the Committee. In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, all meetings will be announced in the Federal Register at least 15 days in advance. The meetings will be open to observers and the public, and some time will be allocated at each meeting for public comment. A project web site, hosted by the Commission, should be designed to become the resource for all information about the Committee, including background documents, presentations, meeting summaries and advance agendas, etc. The Commission should also develop a method of providing ongoing information directly to those who request it, in either electronic or hard copy format. This targeted outreach will help inform public comment at the meetings.

V. Conclusion

The assessment process has shown a promising prognosis for the usefulness of convening and supporting a Federal Advisory Committee on Anthropogenic Sound and Marine Mammals. Key participants expressed a willingness to participate, and in many cases, a desire for a constructive forum on these issues. The proposed Advisory Committee has a good chance of moving the issues forward, and it has the potential to achieve agreement on a course of action for the next decade that reflects existing knowledge and acknowledges the evolving nature of scientific understanding on this topic and appropriate regulations and management/mitigation strategies.

Appendices

A. List of individuals interviewed

B. Interview Protocol

APPENDIX A

Proposed Dialogue on Anthropogenic Sound and Marine Mammals Interview List

(as of November 21, 2003)

1. Jean Adams, Port Canaveral Port Authority
2. Dan Allen, Chevron/Texaco
3. Mark Anderson, Orca Relief
4. Joe Angelo, U.S. Coast Guard
5. Ken Balcomb, Center for Whale Research, Inc.
6. Jay Barlow, NOAA Fisheries Southwest Fisheries Science Center
7. Linda Bauch, American Petroleum Institute
8. Joshua Bauer, U.S. Coast Guard
9. Jon Berkson, U.S. Coast Guard
10. Diane Bowen, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Fish & Wildlife Service
11. Todd Burrows, Maine State Planning Office
12. Jack Caldwell, Reservoir Services
13. Chris Clark, Cornell University Laboratory of Ornithology (*interview pending as of Dec. 4 2003*)
14. Tara Cox, Marine Mammal Commission
15. Penny Dalton, Consortium for Oceanographic Research and Education
16. Mark Delaplaine, California Coastal Commission
17. John S. Devens, Prince William Sound Regional Citizen's Advisory Council
18. Sarah Dolman, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society
19. Richard du Moulin, Intrepid Shipping (formerly of INTERTANKO)
20. Raymond Fisher, Noise Control Engineers
21. Phil Fontana, American Petroleum Institute
22. Rod Fujita, Environmental Defense
23. Roger Gentry, NOAA Fisheries, Office of Protected Resources
24. Chip Gill, International Assn. of Geophysical Contractors
25. Bob Gisiner, Office of Naval Research , U.S. Navy
26. Jonathan Gordon, University of St Andrews (*interview pending as of Dec. 4 2003*)
27. Mike Gosliner, Marine Mammal Commission
28. Marsha Green, Ocean Mammal Institute
29. Mardi Hastings, Office of Naval Research
30. Erin Heskett, International Fund for Animal Welfare
31. John Hildebrand, Scripps Institute of Oceanography and Marine Mammal Commission
32. Charlotte Hudson, Oceana
33. Michael Jasny, Natural Resources Defense Council
34. Paul Jepson, Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London
35. Lindy Johnson, NOAA Office of International Environmental Law
36. Robert Kanter, The Long Beach Port Authority
37. Zvi Karni, John J. McMullen Associates
38. Charles Kennel, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
39. Darlene Ketten, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute/Harvard University
40. Rajiv Khandpur, U.S. Coast Guard
41. Martin Kodis, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Fish & Wildlife Service

42. Karen Kohanowich, U.S. Navy, Office of Assistant Secretary
43. Bob LaBelle, Minerals Management Service *(interview pending as of Dec. 4 2003)*
44. David Laist, Marine Mammal Commission
45. Bill Lang, Minerals Management Service – Gulf of Mexico Region (GOMR)
46. Gerald Leape, National Environmental Trust
47. CDR Daniel MacLeod, U.S. Coast Guard
48. Rodger Melton, Exxon-Mobil
49. Jennifer Merrill, National Research Council, Ocean Studies Board
50. Kathy Metcalf, Chamber of Shipping of America
51. Paul Nachtigall, Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology
52. John Orcutt, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
53. Mark Palmer, Earth Island Institute
54. Katy Penland, American Cetacean Society
55. RADM Richard Pittenger, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
56. Mike Purdy, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
57. Tim Ragen, Marine Mammal Commission
58. Jim Ray, Shell Global Solutions, U.S.
59. Tom Readinger, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Minerals Management Service
60. Joel Reynolds, Natural Resources Defense Council
61. John Richardson, LGL Limited
62. Naomi Rose, Human Society of the United States
63. Bill Rossiter, Cetacean Society International
64. Bruce Russell, JS&A Environmental Services, Inc.
65. Chuck Schoennagel, Minerals Management Service - GOMR *(interview pending as of Dec. 4 2003)*
66. Alexander Shor, National Science Foundation
67. Mark Simmonds, Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society
68. Lanny Sinkin, Rainbow Friends Animal Sanctuary
69. Brandon Southall, NOAA Fisheries, Office of Protected Resources
70. Frank Stone, U.S. Navy - Operations
71. Jeanette Thomas, Laboratory of Sensory Biology, Eastern Illinois Univ. Regional Ctr.
72. Peter Tyack, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
73. Courtney Vail, Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society
74. Sara Wan, California Coastal Commission
75. Doug Wartzok, Florida International University and Marine Mammal Commission
76. Lindy Weilgart, Dalhousie University
77. Admiral Richard West, Consortium for Ocean Research and Education
78. Donna Wieting, NOAA Fisheries, Office of Protected Resources
79. Ben White, Animal Welfare Institute
80. Judy Wilson, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Minerals Management Service
81. Peter Worcester, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
82. Russell Wray, Citizens Opposed to Active Sonar
83. Nina Young, The Ocean Conservancy

APPENDIX B

Proposed Dialogue on Anthropogenic Sound and Marine Mammals

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Introduction to facilitators
 - who we are
 - description/background of proposed project – who, what, why & objectives
 - purpose of interviews – how part of process
 - our role
2. What is your/your organization's interest and role with regard to the issue of the impacts of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals (currently and/or historically)?
3. What do you believe are the critical questions/issues that need to be addressed to take this issue to the next level? How would you prioritize them?
4. What are your/your organization's goals with respect to this issue?
5. What do you think are the major challenges or barriers that will need to be addressed in order to make meaningful progress on this topic (both substantive and procedural)?
6. What do you think would be the appropriate relative emphasis on science v. management/policy in a new discussion?
7. What do you think would be the most important information needed to inform this discussion and what are the best sources of that information?
8. What voices need to be at the table to have a full and productive dialogue on this topic (interest groups/individuals)?
9. Have you ever participated in a collaborative dialogue process focusing on a controversial topic (if so, describe the process, your role in it, and any insights or lessons you learned from the process that might inform a new process)?
10. What mechanisms or procedures does your organization have for keeping its constituents informed and seeking their feedback and/or support?
11. We will only be able to include a limited number of individuals at the table for this dialogue; if you (or your organization) are not chosen to be the representative of your perspective at the table, whom would you like to see at the table that could represent your interests and perspective?
12. Would you/your organization be interested, willing and available to participate in an 18-month collaborative dialogue process to address this topic, should you be invited?